UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,686	06/20/2001	Paul Peterson	30020/37197	6375
	7590 06/11/2007 GERSTEIN & BORUN L.	LP	EXAN	MINER
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300			FISHER, MICHAEL J	
SEARS TOWE CHICAGO, IL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	:
		·.	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
				L
			06/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/885,686	PETERSON, PAUL			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Michael J. Fisher	3629			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAILING DANS IN THE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MONTH IN THE	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)[🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 M	<u>arch 2007</u> .				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-4,6-9 and 11-26 is/are pending in th 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-4,6-9 and 11-26 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	•				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)(Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) Notice 2) Notice 3) Inform	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 09/885,686

Art Unit: 3629

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-4,6-9,11-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PAT 5,666,215 to Fredlund et al. (Fredlund) as modified by US PAT 5,924,870 to Brosh et al. (Brosh).

As to claims 1, Fredlund discloses a system and method of producing a novelty item comprising transmitting images over a communication link (col 2, lines 34-40, which communication link would include the Internet), receiving a theme identifier chosen and merging that with personal images received (col 1, lines 22-26, col 7, lines 2-3), digitally combining the images (col 1, lines 22-23), printing the image (fig 7C), and receiving a shipping address and shipping the item to the address (col 8, lines 57-64).

Application/Control Number: 09/885,686

Art Unit: 3629

Fredlund does not, however, teach using the method and system for lenticular items.

Brosh teaches method and system of producing a lenticular item using a composite picture with interleaved format (abstract), thereby meeting the limitations as claimed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system as taught by Fredlund for lenticular images as taught by Brosh as both teach this as a way of creating images.

As to claim 8, Fredlund as modified by Brosh teach a method and system as above. They further teach a network receiver (modem 46, fig 7C), a memory device (138, fig 7C), an integration module (computer software, as the images are integrated by the computer), an interlacer (as the images are interlaced or interweaved), a printer (106,108,110 in fig 7C).

As to claims 4,11,15, Fredlund discloses retrieving foreground and background images (col 1, lines 22-26). Fredlund does not, however, teach editing the images.

Editing images is old and well known in the art, therefore, it would have been obvious to allow for images to be edited for aesthetic purposes.

As to claims 2,13,16, Fredlund discloses transmitting images via the communications link (col 8, lines 40-44).

As to claims 3,17, as the image would be lenticular, it would inherently be made of data indicative of two dimensional frames as this is how lenticular images are formed.

Art Unit: 3629

As to claims 6,12,21, it would have been obvious to include positioning marks so the customer could assemble the image properly so as to have a lenticular effect.

As to claims 7,22, Brosh teaches using adhesive (col 4, lines 10-12).

As to claims 9,14 as the images are lenticular, they would inherently have a foreground and a background image (a plurality of images).

As to claim 18, Fredlund teaches receiving a theme identifier (col 1, lines 22-26).

As to claim 19 as discussed, the images are interleaved.

As to claim 20, as the images are lenticular, they would inherently have a foreground and a background image (a plurality of images).

As to claim 23, Fredlund discloses receiving the customer's address (col 6, lines 22-28).

As to claim 24, Fredlund discloses the item as being shipped (abstract, last line).

As to claim 25, the item is printed, thereby meeting the limitations as claimed.

As to claim 26, Fredlund discloses receiving the customer's address (col 6, lines 22-28) and further discloses the item as being shipped (abstract, last line).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/15/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The amendment as filed has merely clarified how a lenticular image is formed, a process that is old and well known (as can be seen in the prior art of record). Both the instant invention and Fredlund disclose themed, souvenir pictures. To merely take Fredlund's idea and use it for a different form of picture would not make the instant

Page 5

application patentably distinct as lenticular images are old and well known, as can be seen in the Brosh reference.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Fisher whose telephone number is 571-272-6804. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30am-5:00pm alt Fri. off.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael Fisher

Patent Examiner GAU 3629